



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/526,483	03/15/2000	Yoshiyuki Mochizuki	2000-0309A	1664

7590 07/30/2003

Wenderoth Lind & Ponack LLP
2033 K Street NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

MCCARTNEY, LINZY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2671

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/526,483

Applicant(s)

MOCHIZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

Linzy McCartney

Art Unit

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 38-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 38-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 46-48 recite the limitation "said data conversion". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 38, 39, 41-44, and 49-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,999,173 to Ubillos in view of WO 98/52356 to Chang et al

- a. Referring to claim 38, Ubillos discloses a user interface unit operable to select a component to be operated by a user from among the plural components and inputting operational contents of the selected component (column 5, lines 33-35; column 8, lines 26-36; Fig. 4 and 5). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose a correction unit operable to generate a corrected stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the operational contents inputted by said user interface unit and to output the corrected stream. Chang discloses a correction unit operable to generate a corrected stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the operational contents inputted by said user interface unit and to output the corrected

stream (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

b. Claim 39 is rejected per claim 38. Ubillos does not explicitly disclose a stream data reception unit operable to receive the input stream wherein said correction unit is further operable to correct the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the operational contents before outputting the corrected stream. Chang discloses a stream data reception unit operable to receive the input stream (Fig. 12; page 22, paragraph 4) wherein said correction unit is further operable to correct the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the operational contents before outputting the corrected stream (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without

Art Unit: 2671

having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

c. Referring to claim 41, Ubillos does not explicitly disclose a reproduction unit operable to decode the corrected stream, which is outputted from the correction unit, to reproduce the computer graphics. Chang discloses a reproduction unit operable to decode the corrected stream, which is outputted from the correction unit, to reproduce the computer graphics (Fig. 12; page 23, paragraph 4). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

d. Referring to claim 42, Ubillos does not explicitly disclose a display unit operable to real-time display the computer graphics reproduced by said reproduction unit. Chang discloses a display unit operable to real-time display the computer graphics reproduced by said reproduction unit (Fig. 12). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video

(Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

d. Referring to claim 43, Ubillos does not explicitly disclose wherein said correction unit is operable to correct the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected data with data based on the operational contents; Ubillos does not explicitly disclose a user data transmission unit operable to transmit the selected components and the operational contents of the selected component to a second stream correction apparatus; a user data reception unit operable to receive a second component selected by a second user interface unit of the second stream correction apparatus and second operational contents of the second selected component; replacing motion data of the second selected component with data based on the second operational contents before outputting the corrected stream. Chang discloses correction unit is operable to correct the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected data with data based on the operational contents (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3); a user data transmission unit operable to transmit the selected components and the operational contents of the selected component to a second stream correction apparatus (Fig. 12; page 22, paragraph 4; page 23, paragraph 1); a user data reception unit operable to receive a second component selected by a second user interface unit of the second stream correction apparatus and second operational contents of the second selected component (Fig. 12; page 22, paragraph 4; page 23, paragraph 1); and replacing motion data of the second selected component with data based on the second operational contents before outputting the corrected stream (page 23, paragraph 1; page 19, paragraph

Art Unit: 2671

3). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a user data transmission unit, a user data reception unit, and replacing motion data of a second selected component as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network, such as the Internet (page 6, paragraph 4).

e. Referring to claim 44, Ubillos discloses a user interface operable to select an object or an object part to be operated by a user from among the plural components and to input operational contents of the selected object or object part (column 5, lines 33-35; column 8, lines 26-36). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose a correction unit operable to generate a corrected stream by replacing the motion data of the selected object or object part with data based on the operational contents inputted by said user interface unit and to output the corrected stream. Chang discloses a correction unit operable to generate a corrected stream by replacing the motion data of the selected object or object part with data based on the operational contents and to output the corrected stream (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow

users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

f. Referring to claim 49, Ubillos does not explicitly disclose said computer graphics reproduction apparatus comprising a reproduction unit operable to decode the corrected stream, which is outputted from the correction unit to reproduce the computer graphics. Chang discloses said computer graphics reproduction apparatus comprising a reproduction unit operable to decode the corrected stream, which is outputted from the correction unit to reproduce the computer graphics (Fig. 12; page 23, paragraph 4). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

g. Referring to claim 50, Ubillos does not explicitly disclose said computer graphics display apparatus comprising a display unit operable to real time display the computer graphics reproduced by said reproduction unit. Chang discloses said computer graphics display apparatus comprising a display unit operable to real time display the computer graphics reproduced by said reproduction unit. (Fig. 12). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang.

Art Unit: 2671

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

h. Referring to claim 51, Ubillos does not explicitly disclose a stream correction apparatus for correcting part of a first stream said stream correction apparatus comprising a user interface unit a correction unit; a user interface unit operable to select a component to be operated by a user from among the plural components and to input operational contents of the selected component (column 5, lines 33-35; column 8, lines 25-37); wherein said correction unit is operable to generate a corrected stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the operational contents inputted and to output the corrected stream (Fig. 12, column 8, lines 25-37; column 7, lines 34-43). Ubillos does not explicitly teach a stream transmission apparatus for transmitting a first stream in which motion data of plural components constituting computer graphics are packetized with time information in time sequence. Chang discloses a stream correction apparatus for correcting part of a first stream said stream correction apparatus comprising a user interface unit a correction unit (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3); a stream transmission apparatus for transmitting a first stream in which motion data of plural components constituting computer graphics are packetized with time information in time sequence (Fig. 12; page 22, paragraph 4; page 23, paragraph 1). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify

the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a user data transmission unit, a user data reception unit, and replacing motion data of a second selected component as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network, such as the Internet (page 6, paragraph 4).

i. Referring to claim 52, Ubillos discloses selecting a component to be operated by a user from among the plural components (column 5, lines 33-35); inputting operational contents of the selected component (column 8, lines 25-37). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents and outputting the corrected stream. Chang discloses correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents and outputting the corrected stream (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

j. Referring to claim 53, Ubillos discloses selecting a component to be operated by a user from among the plural components (column 5, lines 33-35); inputting operational

contents of the selected component (column 8, lines 25-37). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; outputting the corrected stream and reproducing the computer graphics by decoding the outputted corrected input stream. Chang discloses correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; outputting the corrected stream and reproducing the computer graphics by decoding the outputted corrected input stream (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

k. Referring to claim 54, Ubillos discloses selecting a component to be operated by a user from among the plural components (column 5, lines 33-35); inputting operational contents of the selected component (column 8, lines 25-37). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; outputting the corrected stream and reproducing the computer graphics by decoding the outputted corrected input stream. Chang discloses correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the

selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; outputting the corrected stream and reproducing the computer graphics by decoding the outputted corrected input stream (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

1. Referring to claim 55, Ubillos discloses selecting a component to be operated by a user from among the plural components (column 5, lines 33-35); inputting operational contents of the selected component (column 8, lines 25-37). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents and outputting the corrected stream. Chang discloses correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents and outputting the corrected stream (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which

allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

m. Referring to claim 56, Ubillos discloses selecting a component to be operated by a user from among the plural components (column 5, lines 33-35); inputting operational contents of the selected component (column 8, lines 25-37). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; outputting the corrected stream and reproducing the computer graphics by decoding the outputted corrected input stream. Chang discloses correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; outputting the corrected stream and reproducing the computer graphics by decoding the outputted corrected input stream (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

n. Referring to claim 57, Ubillos discloses selecting a component to be operated by a user from among the plural components (column 5, lines 33-35); inputting operational

Art Unit: 2671

contents of the selected component (column 8, lines 25-37). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; and outputting the corrected stream and displaying in real time, the reproduced computer graphics. Chang discloses correcting the input stream by replacing the motion data of the selected component with data based on the inputted operational contents; and outputting the corrected stream and displaying in real time, the reproduced computer graphics (page 16, paragraph 4; page 18, paragraph 2; page 20, paragraph 3; page 23, paragraph 3). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by incorporating a correction unit as taught by Chang. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow editing in the compressed domain which allows users to manipulate a specific object without having to fully decode the video (Chang, page 5, paragraph 1) and it would allow users to manipulate video information over a distributed network (Chang, page 6, paragraph 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2671

2. Claims 40, 45, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ubillos in view of Chang as applied to claims 39 and 44 above, and further in view of U.S.

Patent No. 5,288,993 to Bidiville et al.

a. Referring to claim 40, Ubillos discloses the correction unit is further operable to correct the input stream by replacing the motion data with data based on the operational contents inputted by said user interface unit of the selected component before outputting the correction stream (Fig. 12; column 8, lines 25-37; column 7, lines 34-43). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose a data conversion unit operable to convert the operational contents into second data suited to the motion data of the selected component and to output the second data. Bidiville discloses a data conversion unit operable to convert operational contents into second data and to output the second data in place of the operational contents (column 2, lines 52-54). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by including a data conversion unit operable to convert the operational contents into second data and to output the second data in place of the operational contents as taught by Bidiville. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because Ubillos teachings using a pointing device to input instructions to the apparatus (column 5, lines 16-22) and the data conversion unit of Bidiville overcomes the limitations (i.e., accuracy) of the mechanical elements associated with pointing devices (column 2, lines 27-30).

b. Referring to claim 45, Ubillos discloses the correction unit is further operable to correct the input stream by replacing the motion data with data based on the operational

contents inputted by said user interface unit of the selected component before outputting the correction stream (Fig. 12; column 8, lines 25-37; column 7, lines 34-43). Ubillos does not explicitly disclose a data conversion unit operable to convert the operational contents into second data suited to the motion data of the selected component and to output the second data. Bidiville discloses a data conversion unit operable to convert operational contents into second data and to output the second data in place of the operational contents (column 2, lines 52-54). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by including a data conversion unit operable to convert the operational contents into second data and to output the second data in place of the operational contents as taught by Bidiville. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because Ubillos teachings using a pointing device to input instructions to the apparatus (column 5, lines 16-22) and the data conversion unit of Bidiville overcomes the limitations (i.e., accuracy) of the mechanical elements associated with pointing devices (column 2, lines 27-30).

c. Referring to claim 48, Ubillos does not explicitly disclose said data conversion unit is operable to use a pre-taught neural network when converting the operational contents into data suited to the motion data of the selected object or object part. Bidiville discloses a data conversion unit is operable to use a pre-taught neural network when converting operational data (column 2, lines 49-55). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos by including a data conversion unit which uses a pre-taught neural network to

Art Unit: 2671

convert the operational data as taught by Bidiville. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to increase the speed of the conversion process.

3. Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ubillos in view of Chang as applied to claim 44 above in view of Bidiville further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,793,356 to Svancarek.

a. Referring to claim 46, Ubillos does not explicitly disclose said data conversion unit is operable to use tabled conversion data when converting the operational contents into data suited to the motion data of the selected object or object part. Bidiville discloses a data conversion unit (column 2, lines 52-54). Svancarek discloses using tabled conversion data when converting operational content (column 12, line 66 – column 13, line 17). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Ubillos to incorporate a data conversion unit as taught by Bidiville and to use tabled conversion data as taught by Svancarek. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because Ubillos teachings using a pointing device to input instructions to the apparatus (column 5, lines 16-22) and the data conversion unit of Bidiville overcomes the limitations (i.e., accuracy) of the mechanical elements associated with pointing devices (column 2, lines 27-30) and using tabled conversion data increases the speed of the conversion process.

b. Referring to claim 47, Ubillos does not explicitly disclose used tabled key conversion data when converting the operational contents into data suited to the motion data of the selected object or object part. As noted above Svancarek discloses using tabled conversion data when converting operational content (column 12, line 66 – column

Art Unit: 2671

13, line 17), however Svancarek does not explicitly disclose interpolating the conversion data. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the apparatus of Ubillos by interpolating the conversion data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it would allow values not explicitly listed in the table to be converted.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Linzy McCartney** whose telephone number is **(703) 605-0745**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday (8:00AM-5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Mark Zimmerman**, can be reached at **(703) 305-9798**.

Art Unit: 2671

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

ltm

July 24, 2003



**MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**